

REMARKS

STATUS OF CLAIMS

Claims 1-56 and 58-66 were previously pending.

Claims 1, 7, 12, 21, 36, and 56 have been amended, claims 27, 30, 32, and 34-35 have been cancelled, while no claims have been added. Therefore, claims 1-26, 28-29, 31, 33, 36-56, and 58-66 are pending and are submitted for reconsideration.

PRIOR ART REJECTIONS

Rejection under 35 USC §102

In the office action, claims 1-3 were rejected under 35 USC §102 as being anticipated by US Patent No. 6,154,844 (hereafter Touboul '844). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the following reasons.

Independent claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, a method of displaying a web page at a client device which includes, *inter alia*, the features of (1) detecting an object associated with the web page at the client device, wherein the object does not include a downloadable security profile, generated by an external content inspection engine, attached thereto; (2) assessing at the client device, as part of displaying the web page, which of plural trust levels is to be accorded to the object without using or generating the downloadable security profile. Specifically, Touboul '844 discloses that a developer system 120 and an inspector system 125 (that is external to the developer system 120) attach a downloadable security profile (DSP) for a downloadable that is generated by the inspector system 125 which includes a content inspection engine 160. See, for example, col. 4, lines 1-10 of Touboul '844. Figure 2 of Touboul '844 discloses a downloadable with an attached DSP 215 which includes a downloadable ID 220. The flowchart of figure 7 discloses a method of examining a downloadable as taught by Touboul '844. As shown in steps 730 and step 750, the examining process includes either extracting one or more DSPs or generating a DSP. Therefore, Touboul '844 does not disclose or suggest either the features (1) or (2) identified above.

"A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference" *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631 (Fed. Cir. 1987). "The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim." *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, (Fed. Cir. 1989). See MPEP §2131. In order for a reference to be utilized as an anticipatory reference under the provisions of 35 U.S.C. § 102, the reference must disclose each and every claimed element. This is certainly not the case here, and thus the Sec. 102 rejection as to independent claim 1 (and claims 2-3 dependent therefrom) must be withdrawn.

Rejections under 35 USC §103

In the office action, claim 4 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Touboul '844. Claims 5-8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Touboul '844 in view of US Patent No. 6,202,207 (hereafter "Donohue") and in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0098883 (hereafter "Pennell"). Claims 9-56 and 58-66 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Touboul '844 in view Pennell. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections, with respect to the pending claims, for at least the following reasons.

Independent claim 21 recites, *inter alia*, the following features: (1) determine, at the client device, a trust level for an object associated with a web page to be displayed at the client device, the object not having a downloadable security profile, generated by an external content inspection engine, attached thereto, (2) suppress an action associated with the object based on the trust level without using or generating the downloadable security profile; and (3) provide an activation opportunity for the action, wherein the activation opportunity comprises a user interface that displays a modeless prompt which provides a description of the object being suppressed.

None of these recited features are disclosed by the applied references. Specifically, neither Touboul '844 (or Touboul '520 incorporated therein) disclose anything related to features (1)-(3) above. Touboul '844 discloses that a developer system 120 and an inspector system 125 including a content inspection engine 160

(which is external to the developer system 120) attach a downloadable security profile (DSP) for a downloadable. See, for example, col. 4, lines 1-10 of Touboul '844. Figure 2 of Touboul '844 discloses a downloadable with an attached DSP 215 which includes a downloadable ID 220. The flowchart of figure 7 discloses a method of examining a downloadable as taught by Touboul '844. As shown in steps 730 and step 750, the examining process includes either extracting one or more DSPs or generating a DSP. Therefore, Touboul '844 does not disclose or suggest either the features (1) or (2) identified above.

The office action acknowledged that Touboul '844 does not disclose feature (3) (see for example, the discussion of a similar feature in previously pending claim 7 discussed in paragraph 13 of the office action). Rather, the office action relies on Pennell with respect to this feature and cites to paragraphs 0043 and 0081 of Pennell which discloses a method for blocking "bad" windows and displaying "good" windows based on a window analyzer determining whether a window is good or bad based on characteristics of a window. However, this disclosure of Pennell while useful does not disclose the claimed interface that displays a modeless prompt which provides a description of the object being suppressed. It should be noted that paragraph 0032 in the applicants' specification describes the modeless prompt (consistent with its understanding by one skilled in the art) as a prompt "that does not provide a user with an opportunity to interactively accept or decline activation for the object 208, [while] the modeless prompt may display a description for the object 208 which *facilitates* further opportunity for the user to interactively accept or decline activation of the action." None of these aspects of the claimed modeless prompt and its use is disclosed by the cited portion (or elsewhere) of Pennell. Specifically, the suppression of the bad windows (which are presumably something equivalent to the claimed objects) does not display a prompt with a description of the object (i.e., a description of the bad window) as required by feature (3) of independent claim 21.

Since all of these features recited in independent claim 21 are not disclosed or suggested by either Touboul '844 or Pennell or their reasonable combination, the office

action fails to make a *prima facie* case of obviousness with respect to independent claim 21.

The independent claims 36, and 56 recite apparatuses that are also patentable for reasons that are very similar to that discussed above with respect to claim 21.

Specifically, independent claim 36 recites, *inter alia*, a detector to detect an object associated with a web page as a part of displaying the web page at a client device, wherein the object is not associated with a downloadable security profile, generated by an external content inspection engine, associated therewith, and an analyzer on the client device configured to perform a trust analysis for the object without using or generating the downloadable security profile. As discussed above in the context of claim 21, these features recited in claim 36 are not disclosed or suggested by the applied references.

Independent claim 56 recites, *inter alia*, means for detecting an object associated with the web page at the client device; the object not being associated with a downloadable security profile generated by an external content inspection engine, and means for performing a trust analysis, at the client device, for the object as a part of displaying the web page, wherein the trust analysis is performed without using or generating the downloadable security profile. As discussed in the context of claim 21, these recited features in claim 56 are also not disclosed or suggested by the applied references.

In view of the several deficiencies in the applied references, independent claims 36 and 56 are also believed to be patentable over the applied references since the office action fails to make a *prima facie* case of obviousness with respect to recited features.

DEPENDENT CLAIMS

The dependent claims are deemed to be patentable at least based on their dependence from allowable independent claims. In addition, they recite patentable subject matter when considered as a whole.

Specifically, **dependent claim 7** recites that a modeless prompt that indicates a suppression of an object and wherein the modeless prompt also provides a description

of the object being suppressed. No such disclosure is provided by any of the applied references. Specifically, with respect to modeless prompts, the office action cites to Pennell, paragraph [0081]. However, this disclosure of Pennell only discloses that identified bad windows (presumably being mapped in the office action to the claimed object) are **blocked and does not disclose anything related to the claimed modeless prompt which also provides a description of the object being suppressed.** In fact, even when the blocked windows are hidden from the user's view, the user may simply have an opportunity to review the windows themselves **and are not provided *any description of the object being suppressed in a separate modeless prompt.*** Accordingly, this feature is not disclosed or even suggested by the applied references and provides an additional reason for the patentability of dependent claim 7.

Dependent claim 42 also recites a similar feature which is also patentable for reasons that are similar to that discussed above with respect to claim 7. Accordingly, these dependent claim 42 is also patentable for this additional reason.

CONCLUSION

Accordingly, applicants submit that the application is now in condition for allowance and an indication of the same is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that the application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is respectfully requested to call the Applicants' representative at the telephone number listed below.

If this Amendment is not considered timely filed and if a request for an extension of time is otherwise absent, Applicant hereby requests any necessary extension of time. If there is a fee occasioned by this Response, including an extension fee that is not covered by an enclosed check please charge any deficiency to Deposit Account No. 50-0463.

Respectfully submitted,
Microsoft Corporation

Date: March 26, 2008

By: /Aaron C. Chatterjee/

Aaron C. Chatterjee
Reg. No. 41,398
Attorney for Applicants
Direct telephone (425) 706-7453
Microsoft Corporation
One Microsoft Way
Redmond WA 98052-6399

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING OR TRANSMISSION
(Under 37 CFR § 1.8(a)) or ELECTRONIC FILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being electronically deposited with the USPTO via EFS-Web on the date shown below:

March 26, 2008
Date

/Noemi Toyar/
Noemi Toyar